



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,747	07/28/2003	Tamotsu Yamamoto	2003_0855A	4403
52349	7590	10/02/2007	EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P. 2033 K. STREET, NW SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2179				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/02/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/627,747	YAMAMOTO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Nicholas Augustine	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-7 and 10-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-7 and 10-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Request for Continued Examination filed: 8/21/2007.
- B. Claims 1,3-7,10-16 remains pending.

---

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 1-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuk et al (US 2003/0076301 A1), herein referred to as Tsuk, in view of Buckley et

al (US 2003/0135649 A1), herein referred to as Buckley, in further view of Rohrabaugh et al. (US 2002/0091738), herein referred to as Rohrabaugh.

As for independent claim 1, Tsuk teaches a portable electronic device (700) comprising: a first manipulator means (712A) supplying a signal for performing a first screen process on information displayed on a display (par.70, line 8); a second manipulator means (710) for supplying a circumferential movement signal for performing a second screen process on the information displayed on the display (924), said second manipulator means including a ring-shaped manipulator having an inner circumference side (710), and outer circumference side (712A), and a bottom surface (it is apparent there exist a bottom to the top surface depicted in element 710), said second manipulator means for supplying the circumferential movement signal according to said ring-shaped manipulator means (par.70, figure 7B); and a controller for interfacing with said first manipulator means, said second manipulator means, and the display, wherein: said first manipulator (712A-B) means is arranged at either the inner circumference side or the outer circumference side of the said ring shaped manipulator (712AorB) (par.73, lines 1-3); responsive to the signal supplied from said first manipulator means, said controller is operable to perform the first screen process by scrolling the information displayed on the display and selecting a display position (par.70, line 8); and responsive to the circumferential movement signal supplied from said second manipulator means (934), said controller is operable to perform the second screen process (934 and par.73, lines 1-3). the second screen process being one of a process of switching the screen

with the selected display position as a reference (par.81, lines 3-4). Tsuk does not specifically mention the second screen process being one of scaling up the information, scaling down the information. However in the same field of endeavor Buckley teaches the second screen process being one of scaling up, scaling down, and switching the screen with the selected display position as a reference (par.22, line 3 and 14-15 and figs.2-4). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the method of Buckley into the device and method of Tsuk. The motivation to combine is fast and easy views of data for reading at higher resolutions in another words zooming in (par.20, lines 5-8) Also it is true that is appreciated that the method of Buckley can easily be implemented into the device and methods of Tsuk for the purposes of the user being able to see data at higher resolutions for a better view to make up for the small screen real estate. Also note that Tsuk's invention is not limited to a media player and can be in the form of any standard common portable device such as a cell phone, PDA or the like as suggested by Tsuk (par.38, lines 15-17). Tsuk in view of Buckley does not specifically mention when scaling information that it is the same information, wherein Buckley teaches taking one website and breaking it up into a plurality of pieces of a document and when the user zooms into an area another file is received by the user which is arguable not the same information (one file). However in the same field of endeavor Rohrbaugh teaches a process of scaling up the same information displayed on the display , scaling down the same information displayed on the display (par.45,50 and 100-101; wherein one document is received by the user pertaining to a request of a URL from the user to a server. The file received is a SVG (scalable vector graphic)

representing the web page requested, wherein the user is able to scale the webpage to different resolutions on small hand held device). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Rohrabaugh into Tsuk as modified by Buckley, this is true because Rohrabaugh teaches of the same problem sought to be solved as Buckley (fitting high resolution documents onto low resolution devices, par.8).

*Please note the analysis of claim 1 for claims 3-15 below*

As for dependent claim 3, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic device of claim 1, wherein said ring-shaped manipulator is operable to rotate circumferentially; and said second manipulator means (910, 934) includes a rotation detector for detecting a direction (par.77, line13) and an amount of rotation of said ring-shaped manipulator (par.79, line 15).

As for dependent claim 4, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic device of claim 3, wherein said rotation detector is arranged so as to interface with the bottom surface of said ring-shaped manipulator (fig.8B, 854,852); and said rotation detector comprises: a rotation magnet magnetized according to alternating north and south intervals of an equal angle, and fixed on the bottom surface of said ring-shaped manipulator (856) (par.77) and a pair of magnetic sensors arranged so as to be opposed to said rotatable ring-shaped manipulator (par.79, lines 7-10 and fig.12) and arranged with a

predetermined clearance between said pair of magnetic sensors and said ring magnet(fig.8B); and said rotation detector is operable to detect movement of said ring magnet in relation to said pair of magnetic sensors (par.91, line 3 and 7). **Note:** That the sensors are optical or electronic instead of magnets that are magnetized for this purpose it is appreciated that all three solve the same problem of sensing and that is well known in the art that optical and electronic methods are a new generation of sensing, detecting signals that provide better results than of magnetic methods. For the purposes of the analysis of this claim those skilled in the art will appreciate that Tsuk is utilizing a newer method of sensing and if optical or electronic sensors and detectors had not been available at the time of Tsuk invention would have made the use of magnetism with magnetic sensors.

As for dependent claim 5, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic device of claim 3, wherein said controller is operable to perform the second screen process according to the detected direction and the amount of rotation of said ring-shaped manipulator (par.91, lines 9-11 and par.92, lines 6-7). Tsuk does not specially mention that of scaling up, scaling down on the screen. However in the same field of endeavor Buckley teaches the second screen process being one of scaling up, scaling down, and switching the screen with the selected display position as a reference (par.22, line 3 and 14-15 and figs.2-4). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the method of Buckley into the device and method of Tsuk. The motivation to combine

is fast and easy views of data for reading at higher resolutions in another words zooming in (par.20, lines 5-8).

As for dependent claim 6, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic equipment of claim 1, further comprising a circular rubber manipulator having a front and a back (910 and par.77, "scroll wheel" as known in the art typically examples of scroll wheels are made of rubber) a first manipulator means for supplying a signal for performing a first screen process on information displayed on a display, said first manipulator means arranged to interface with the back of said circular rubber manipulator; a second manipulator means for supplying a circumferential movement signal for performing a second screen process on the information displayed on the display, said second manipulator means arranged to interface with the back of said circular rubber manipulator; and a controller (par. 78), wherein: said first manipulator means includes a press button and a self-restoring contact opposed to said press button; said second manipulator means comprises: a ring-shaped conductive depressing portion; and a plurality of concentrically disposed second contacts opposed to said ring-shaped conductive depressing portion with a predetermined clearance between said plurality of concentrically disposed second contacts and said ring-shaped conductive depressing portion; said controller is operable to perform the first screen process by scrolling the information displayed on the display and operable to select a display position according to the signal supplied from said first manipulator means; and said controller is operable

to perform the second screen process (par.79). Tsuk does not specifically mention the graphical user interface scaling by means of rotational input however in the same field of endeavor Buckley teaches the second screen process being one of a process of scaling up the information, scaling down the information, and switching a screen of information displayed on the display with the selected display position as a reference, according to the circumferential movement signal supplied from said second manipulator means. (note the analysis of claims 1,2,3,4,5 above) It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the method of Buckley into the device and method of Tsuk. The motivation to combine is fast and easy views of data for reading at higher resolutions in another words zooming in (par.20, lines 5-8) Also it is true that is appreciated that the method of Buckley can easily be implemented into the device and methods of Tsuk for the purposes of the user being able to see data at higher resolutions for a better view to make up for the small screen real estate. Also note that Tsuk's invention is not limited to a media player and can be in the form of any standard common portable device such as a cell phone, PDA or the like as suggested by Tsuk (par.38, lines 15-17). Tsuk in view of Buckley does not specifically mention when scaling information that it is the same information, wherein Buckley teaches taking one website and breaking it up into a plurality of pieces of a document and when the user zooms into an area another file is received by the user which is arguable not the same information (one file). However in the same field of endeavor Rohrbaugh teaches a process of scaling up the same information displayed on the display , scaling down the same information displayed on the display (par.45,50 and 100-101; wherein

one document is received by the user pertaining to a request of a URL from the user to a server. The file received is a SVG (scalable vector graphic) representing the web page requested, wherein the user is able to scale the webpage to different resolutions on small hand held device). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Rohrabaugh into Tsuk as modified by Buckley, this is true because Rohrabaugh teaches of the same problem sought to be solved as Buckley (fitting high resolution documents onto low resolution devices, par.8).

As for dependent claim 7, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic equipment of claim 6, wherein said controller is operable to perform the first screen process according to an actuation of said self-restoring contact by said press button (par.77); said controller is operable to detect a direction of a circumferential sliding operation of said circular rubber manipulator (note claim 6), and operable to detect an amount of directional rotation of said circular rubber manipulator caused by the circumferential sliding operation (par.77 and 79); and said controller is operable to perform the second screen process according to the detected direction and the amount of directional rotation of said circular rubber manipulator (par.62, line 1-5; item 924 and par.69, line 6).

As for dependent claim 10, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic device of claim 6, wherein said first manipulator means is arranged at an outer circumference of said second manipulator means (712A), and wherein said first manipulator means includes a conductive depressing portion and a first contact opposed to said conductive

depressing portion (par.70, lines 8-12 and par.77, line 15; wherein the first manipulator buttons are appreciated by one of ordinary skill the clicking of a button with the technology presented for the rotatable manipulator share equally the same method although not specifically mentioned.

As for dependent claim 11, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic device of claim 6, wherein; said first manipulator means is operable to detect operation within a same plane (fig.8 B) in a direction different from that of said second manipulator means (par.70, line 10); i.e. angular versus linear.

As for dependent claim 12, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic device of claim 6, wherein said circular rubber manipulator (note claim 1,6) has an indication means for indicating a position of said first manipulator means (923 and par.70, line 8).

As for dependent claim 13, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic device of claim 1, wherein said first manipulator means is a multi-directional switch operated by one of depressing and tilting (fig.7, left, up, down, right directional and par.70, line 8).

As for dependent claim 15, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic device of claim 1 further comprising a built-in display device (904).

As for dependent claim 16, Tsuk teaches the portable electronic device of claim 6, further comprising an integrated display device (LCD; par.67).

4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuk in view of Buckley as applied to claims 1-13 and 15 above, and further in view of Paloniemi (US 2001/0017934 A1).

As for dependent claim 14, Tsuk in view of Buckley teaches the portable electronic device of claim 1 (note the analysis of claim 1), Tsuk in view of Buckley does not specifically mention trackball. However for the same problem sought to be solved Paloniemi teaches wherein said first manipulator means is a track ball (par.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the device and method of Paloniemi into the device and methods of Tsuk as modified by Buckley, this is true because electronic navigation is made easier through input devices such as buttons, wheels, and trackballs (par.2, line 1)

#### ***Response to Arguments***

---

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1,3-7 and 10-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

---

**(Note:)** It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In

re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art cited is related to scaling information.

### ***Inquiries***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Augustine

N. Augustine  
09/29/2007

Examiner  
AU: 2179

BA HUYNH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER